

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed Office Action of 03/10/2005. The submissions made by the Examiner in the Office Action have carefully been considered. Our response is presented below.

Specification

In response to the Examiner's comments in this section appropriate amendments have been introduced to the text on page 1 of the specification.

Drawings

As suggested by the Examiner, appropriate text has been included in the specification to describe the elements marked with reference characters 18, 44, 39, 59, and 49 to 55. Reference character 83 is described in section 26 on page 16 of the specification.

Claim Objection

In response to the Examiner's comments in this section, the expression "support structure" in claim 1 has been substituted with the expression "channel member".

In amendment, not responsive to the Examiner's comments, but aiming to improve the readability of the claims, claims 5 to 7 have also been modified. No new matter has been introduced to the claims by this amendment.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejects claims 1 and 4 – 7 of the present application as being anticipated by the disclosure in Foote et al. (US 5,655,786).

The applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, the Applicant draws the Examiner's attention to the feature of claim 1 referring to the elongate channel member being "*of a metal having thermal expansion properties that are similar to thermal expansion properties of silicon*". This is an essential feature of claim 1 that has neither been disclosed nor suggested in the cited document. Furthermore, the means disclosed in Foote for dealing with the temperature expansion differential between the tiles and the channel member are locating formations 32 and security clips 34 (see text in col.3, line 61 to col.4, line 14). Accordingly, a person skilled in the art apprised with the cited document would not be direct to the above feature, as defined in claim 1 of the present application. Thus, claim 1 is both novel and inventive.

A further important difference from Foote et al. (see claim 5) is the presence of an ink feed member (feature 15 in Fig. 2) that is "*positioned on the floor of the channel member*(feature 16 in Fig. 2)" and is "*in fluid communication with an ink supply* (features 28,34,35 in Fig. 3)". This feature has no direct equivalent in Foote et al. In addition, the ink feed member includes a number of ink channels extending "*longitudinally with respect to the channel*

member". As shown in Fig. 6 of Foote et al., none of the equivalent structures disclosed there includes such longitudinal channels. These are substantial differences that sufficiently distinguish the present invention from the cited US patent.

In view of the above differences, it is submitted that all of the claims of the present invention are novel and inventive in view of Foote et al.

Allowable subject matter

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his helpful comments in this section.

In light of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



KIA SILVERBROOK



TOBIN ALLEN KING

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762